UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,815	08/29/2003	Douglas A. Bulleit	9400-65	2478
	7590 12/05/200 L SIBLEY & SAJOVE	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3742	28	CHAMPAGNE, LUNA		
RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Asticus Occurrence		10/652,815	BULLEIT ET AL.	BULLEIT ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Luna Champagne	3627				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appropriation of the second section appropriate the second section and the second seco	ppears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09</u>	October 2007					
·		is action is non-final.					
	<i>/</i> —						
٥/١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
<b>.</b>	·	Ex parte quayre, 1000 c.	5. 11, 100 G.G. 210.				
· · ·	on of Claims						
-	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
•	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
2) Notice (3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 				

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendment filed on 10/9/07 is acknowledged. Claims 8, 24, and 36 are amended to correct errors in their dependencies. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roden (5,970,477).

Re claims 1, 13, 17 and 29 Roden teaches a method/system of operating a broadband communication network, comprising: establishing a communication flow between a network access terminal and a site using the broadband communication network (providing an originating station with access to a distributed computing network -see e.g. col. 4, lines 61-64); and allocating a cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site between a first account associated with a user of the network access terminal and a second account associated with an entity other than the user of the network access terminal ( A billing system allocates a cost associated with the communication between a first account associated with the

monitored network site and a second account associated with the originating station see e.g. col. 6, lines 19-25).

Page 3

Re claims 2, 14, 18, and 30, Roden teaches a method/system wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site between the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal and the second account associated with the entity other than the user of the network access terminal based on a performance level of the communication flow (see e.g. col. 5, lines 10-13).

Re claims 4, 20, and 32, Roden teaches a method/system further comprising: receiving a request from the network access terminal and/or the site to provide the communication flow at the enhanced performance level; and providing the communication flow at the enhanced performance level (see e.g. col. 4, lines 64-67; col. 5, lines 1-5).

Re claims 5, 21, and 33, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the cost of the communication flow comprises a base cost for providing the communication flow at a base performance level and an incremental cost, in addition to the base cost, for providing the communication flow at an enhanced performance level, and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: (\$5 per month, plus 5 cents per minute - see e.g. col. 5, lines 11-13) allocating the base cost of the communication

flow between the network access terminal and the site to the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal; and allocating the incremental cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site to the second account associated with an entity other than the user of the network access terminal (see e.g. col. 9, lines 50-52).

Re claims 6, 22, and 34, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the cost of the communication flow comprises a base cost for providing the communication flow at a base performance level and an incremental cost, in addition to the base cost, for providing the communication flow at an enhanced performance level, and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the base cost and the incremental cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site to the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal.

Re claims 7, 23, and 35, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the cost of the communication flow comprises a base cost for providing the communication flow at a base performance level and an incremental cost, in addition to the base cost, for providing the communication flow at an enhanced performance level, and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: (see e.g. col. 5, lines 11-13) allocating the base cost and the incremental cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site to the second account associated with an entity other than the user of the network access terminal see e.g. col. 8, lines 48-49).

Re claims 8, 24, and 36 Roden teaches a method/system further comprising: using an authentication mechanism to verify that the network access terminal and/or the site is authorized to modify the performance level of the broadband communication network and/or allocation of the cost of the communication flow (see e.g. col. 10, lines 61-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Re claims 9, 25, and 37, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the request is a first request, the method further comprising: receiving a second request from the network access terminal and/or the site to provide the communication flow at the base performance level; and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site between the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal and the second account associated with at the entity other than the user of the network access terminal based on the performance level of the communication flow if the network access terminal and/or the site is authorized to modify the performance level of the broadband communication network and/or allocation of the cost of the communication flow (see e.g. col. 5, lines 42-60).

Re claims 10, 16, 26, and 38, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the performance level is based on at least one of bandwidth of the communication flow, duration of the communication flow, latency associated with the communication flow,

jitter associated with the communication flow, dropped packets associated with the communication flow, quality of service (QoS) associated with the communication flow, rate limit associated with the communication flow, traffic shaping associated with the communication flow, and priority of the communication flow (*The allocation is based on the duration of the communication - see e.g. col. 5, lines 10-13*).

Re claims 11, 27, and 39, Roden teaches a method/system, wherein the entity is associated with the site (see e.g. col. 4, lines 21-23).

Re claims 12, 28, and 40, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the entity is associated with a third party that is not associated with the site (see e.g. col.9, lines 57-61).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 3, 15, 19, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roden (5,970,477), in view of Kung et al. (6,775,267 B1).

Re claims 3, 15,19, and 31, Roden teaches a method wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the cost of the communication flow between the first account and the second account

Roden does not specifically teach allocating the cost based on whether the communication flow is at a base performance level or an enhanced performance level that exceeds the base performance level

However, Kung et al. teach allocating the cost based on whether the communication flow is at a base performance level (*default quality of service*) or an enhanced performance level that exceeds the base performance level (*required bit rate*) (see e.g. col. 2, lines 50-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Roden, and include the steps of allocating the cost based on base performance level or an enhanced performance level that exceeds the base performance level, as taught by Kung et al., in order to control costs for the communication network.

# Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on October 9, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. .

Applicant argues that Roden does not disclose or suggest "allocating a cost of a communication flow between an account associated with a user of a network access terminal and a second account associated with another entity in a broadband

communication network". The Examiner respectfully disagrees as it is clearly described in column 6, lines 19-25 of Roden. Roden continues teaching a method and system for providing an end-user with Internet-access (broadband) in column 6, lines 26 and 27.

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Kung does not disclose or suggest allocating costs between the end user and another party, such as the service provider, based on the level and/or quality of service provided to the end user. However, in column 2, lines 10-52, Kung et al. teach a method of providing the user with choices of broadband network capabilities including local access (base performance level) and enhanced multi-media services (enhanced performance level). Billing for the communication service is also taught. Therefore, the combination of Roden and Kung et al. teach Applicant's limitations.

#### Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Page 9 Application/Control Number: 10/652,815

Art Unit: 3627

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Fan (US 2003/0079021 A1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Luna Champagne whose telephone number is (571)

272-7177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627

Luna Champagne

Examiner

Art Unit 3627

Application/Control Number: 10/652,815 Page 10

Art Unit: 3627

November 28, 2007